

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,520	11/16/2005	Christopher B. Wood	10103-016-999	6157
20583 JONES DAY	7590 04/10/2008		EXAMINER	
222 EAST 41ST ST			JAVANMARD, SAHAR	
NEW YORK,	NY 10017		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Application No. Applicant(s) 10/529,520 WOOD ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit SAHAR JAVANMARD 1617 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2008. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 17-19 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some \* c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

| Attachment(s) | Attachment(s

Art Unit: 1617

#### DETAILED ACTION

#### Status of the Claims

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Restriction Requirement remarks filed on February 11, 2008. Claim(s) 1-19 are pending. Claim(s) 1-16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant's election of Group II drawn to a composition without traverse of the restriction requirement in the reply is acknowledged. The requirement is deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL. Claim(s) 17-19 are examined herein insofar as they read on the elected invention and species.

### Objections

Claims 18 and 19, the word "insufficient" is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 1617

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Montgomery et al. (US Patent No. 5,384,310).

Examiner respectfully notes that no patentable weight is given for the "intended use" of the pharmaceutical composition containing clofarabine as recited in claims 17-18. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Montgomery teaches 2'-fluoro-2-substituted purine nucleosides, namely clofarabine (column 3, lines 25-39; claim 1), as anticancer agents. Further, Montgomery teaches that the compounds may be administered in a dosage regimen ranging from 10 mg to 1000 mg per day (column 11, lines 14-16).

Thus the limitations of claims 17 and 18 are met.

Art Unit: 1617

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montgomery et al. (US Patent No. 5,384,310) as applied to claims 17 and 18 above in view of Shelley (US Patent No. 5,491,229).

Montgomery is discussed above.

Montgomery does not teach an immunomodulatory agent.

Art Unit: 1617

Shelley teaches 14-methylene rapamycin and its usefulness as an antifungal and anticancer agent as well as possessing immunomodulatory properties (column 1, lines 61-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined clofarabine as taught by Montgomery and further included an immunomodulatory agent. The motivation provided by Shelley, teaches rapamycin, a compound possessing both anticancer and immunomodulatory properties. Since both compounds can be used for the same purpose, namely cancer, one would expect with a reasonable degree of success that the combination will be just as successful, if not more.

The examiner respectfully points out the following from MPEP 2144.06:
"It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose ....[T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art.', *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850,205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980).

# Conclusion

Claims 17-19 are not allowed.

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 10/529,520

Art Unit: 1617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sahar Javanmard whose telephone number is (571)

270-3280. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM-5 PM MON-FRI (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

/S. J./

Examiner, Art Unit 1617

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617